DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 171 199 HE 011 272

AUTHOR Bannerman, James W.
TITLE The Development of a Departmental Policy Relative to the Distribution of Salary Increases for the Faculty of the Industrial Engineering Technology Department at the Southern Technical Institute.
PUB DATE Jun 77
NOTE 38p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrative Policy; *College Faculty; *Departments; Engineering Education; Evaluation Criteria; *Faculty Evaluation; Higher Education; Industrial Education; Institutional Research; *Personnel Policy; Policy Formation; Research Projects; *Salary Differentials; *Teacher Salaries; Technical Institutes
IDENTIFIERS *Southern Technical Institute GA

ABSTRACT

It was the purpose of a practicum to develop a policy for distribution of salary increases in the industrial engineering technology department, using modern wage and salary administration techniques and the management expertise of the faculty. The dean of the Southern Technical Institute and the department head jointly identified seven criteria for evaluation of the faculty. A five-member brainstorming team then established descriptors for these criteria and, after reviewing current literature, developed an institutional policy and procedure (appended) concerning the distribution of salary increases in accordance with measured performance against the criteria. The new policy and procedure were validated by comparing the salary distribution by the new method with the previous distribution. The new policy was found superior to the old method in every case and has been implemented on a trial basis for the next year. The establishment of similar policies by other departments is recommended. (Author/MSE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED171199

THE DEVELOPMENT OF A DEPARTMENTAL POLICY RELATIVE TO THE DISTRIBUTION OF SALARY INCREASES FOR THE FACULTY OF THE INDUSTRIAL ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY DEPARTMENT AT THE SOUTHERN TECHNICAL INSTITUTE

by

James W. Bannerman, M.S., P.E.

Head, Industrial Engineering Technology Department

Southern Technical Institute

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

James W. Bannerman

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

June 1977

IE 011222

ABSTRACT

During the past three decades, major strides have been made in the area of wage and salary administration. There is little evidence, however, that any of the modern techniques have yet been applied to the faculty of post secondary educational institutions. In the past there has been no established policy concerning the distribution of salary increases to the faculty of the Industrial Engineering Technology Department at the Southern Technical Institute. It was the purpose of this practicum to develop such a policy employing modern wage and salary techniques and the management expertise resident in the faculty of the Industrial Engineering Technology (IET) Department at the Institute.

The Dean of the Southern Technical Institute and the Head of the IET Department jointly identified seven criteria to be used in evaluation of the departmental faculty. A five-member brainstorming team then established a set of descriptors for these criteria and, after reviewing current literature in the area, developed an institutional policy and procedure (Appendix A) concerning the distribution of salary increases in accordance with measured performance against the criteria.

The new policy and procedure was validated by comparing the salary distribution obtained by the new method with the previous distribution. The new policy was found superior to the old method in every case and has been implemented on a trial basis for the next year. Copies of this abstract have been sent to other department heads, and a copy of the full practicum has been placed in the Southern Technical Institute Library. The establishment of similar policies by other departments is recommended.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
INTRODUCTION	1
BACKGROUND	3
PROCEDURE	8
RESULTS	9
DISCUSSION	12
IMPLICATIONS, LIMITATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS	15
BIBLIOGRAPHY	19
APPENDIX A. The Developed Policy and Procedure	21
APPENDIX B. Sample Evaluation and Salary Computations	28
APPENDIX C. Tabulation of Validation Results	31

INTRODUCTION

The rating of employees for the purpose of salary administration has long been a problem for supervisor and employee alike. Sin Yu, an early Chinese philosopher, criticized a biased rater during the Wei Dynasty (A.D. 221-65) and pointed out that, "The Imperial Rater of Nine Grades seldom rates men according to their merits but always according to his likes and dislikes." (1:187) Fortunately, major strides have been made in the area of wage and salary administration since Sin Yu's writing seventeen centuries ago; unfortunately however, as several authorities point out, few educational institutions have taken advantage of modern performance evaluation systems in their institutional policies. "Salary administration is a vital part of personnel administration in any college or university. However, little rational planning appears to be used in that area of administration." (15:20) "Indeed, a number of institutions have really no salary plan" (16:42), and "some institutions apparently have no considered salary policy." (3:27) "At most institutions, this is especially true with regard to faculty salaries. In today's no-discrimination climate, more systematic salary administration is needed in higher education in general and in faculty salaries in particular." (15:20)

In the past, there has been no clearly defined and uniformly applied policy concerning the distribution of salary increases at the Southern Technical Institute. In the absence of such policy, not only have the individual faculty members frequently been unsure of the relative importance of the factors considered in determining their raises, but the department heads were forced into a position of defending subjective evaluations which might or might not be reflected by the distribution of salary increases. The Industrial Engineering Technology Department at the Southern Technical Institute has on its faculty, however, a number of highly qualified authorities in the area of modern wage and salary administration. It was the purpose of this practicum to use that faculty expertise in the development of an instrument and the documentation of an institutional policy relative to the distribution of salary increases for the faculty of the Industrial Engineering Technology Department at the Southern Technical Institute. The method employed in that development was the brainstorming technique, as described by Osborn (10:151-93). The team of faculty wage and salary experts considered the criteria to be used for evaluation and, after a review of current management techniques, developed an institutional policy and procedure concerning the distribution of salary increases in

accordance with measured faculty performance against the criteria. The policy was validated and implemented on a one-year test basis.

BACKGROUND

The Southern Technical Institute is a coeducational, residential college for day and evening students. It is a part of the University System of Georgia and that operationally separate unit of the Georgia Institute of Technology dedicated to the educational development of engineering technologists. The college, which is located on a separate campus from Georgia Tech, has a student body of approximately 2000 and a faculty of 80 full-time professional educators. Associate and Bachelor Degrees are granted in Apparel, Architectural, Civil, Electrical, Industrial, Mechanical, and Textile Engineering Technology. Engineering technology as defined by the Engineering Council for Professional Development, the accrediting authority for colleges of engineering and engineering technology, is ". . . part of a continuum extending from the craftsman to the engineer, but closest to the engineer; it requires the application of scientific and engineering principles in support of engineering activities." (5:89)

The Industrial Engineering Technology Department, for which a departmental policy concerning the allocation of

salary increases was developed, has ten full-time and ten part-time faculty members and a department head. The 1976-77 budget for full-time faculty salaries in that department was $140,785, and the allotment for salary increases for 1977-78 was $14,000. The only guidelines provided the department head concerning the distribution of salary increases was that each faculty member must receive at least 2.5%, and no faculty member would receive more than 17% increase. Prior to this practicum, there was no established policy for distribution of these salary increases, and as in previous years the distribution was based purely on the department head's gross subjective evaluation of each faculty member's performance over the past year. This procedure was in direct conflict with modern wage and salary administration philosophy, as highlighted in the review of the literature, and identified a need for the policy developed in this practicum.

In 1957, Douglas McGregor wrote an article concerning the problems involved in traditional performance evaluation and salary administration systems. He concluded that". . . the supervisor is placed in the position of playing God and therefore finds evaluation an unpleasant task." (9:89) When the evaluation system is based on a subjective opinion of the employees performance, the problem becomes even more

complex. As Robert Payer pointed out in the December 1972 issue of Personnel Administration, "Any process that involves communication between people is a difficult one. The work situation is an inviting place for emotive behavior." (13:45) Payer goes on to suggest that nonintegrative emotion (emotion that is at odds with the evaluation process) can be minimized if both the supervisor and the worker understand the problems involved in human communications and genuinely attempt to understand the other's feelings. Specifically, the supervisor can improve the evaluation system by:

(1) Focusing on performance rather than personality of the worker.

(2) Getting the worker to participate--even take the lead--in the evaluation.

(3) Acting as a guide or coach in the process.

(4) Emphasizing what's ahead rather than what has happened.

Although Payer was addressing the general supervisor-employee relationship, his suggestions follow modern salary administration philosophy and may be considered appropriate when dealing with professional educators. Professionals, however, have special characteristics and their salary administration requires special techniques. As David Van Fleet and Douglas

Stone pointed out in the July 1975 issue of College and University Personnel Journal:

> It may be that every person is, in certain respects, like no other person and hence the professional is unique and is, therefore, a monopsonist. But every person is, in certain respects, like some other persons. Too much emphasis on individual differences leads to unadministered salary administration by leaving everything to the whim and fancy of particular administrators: too much emphasis on group commonness or similarities also leads to unadministered administration by leaving it all to single criterion, lock-step procedures. It is to the balanced view that one must turn. (15:24)

Additional thoughts on the characteristics of an effective performance evaluation and salary administration plan are provided by Arthur Handy, Manager of Compensation Programs Design for Kaiser Industries Corporation. Handy states:

> The entire concept of relating pay to performance depends on the manager's ability to establish meaningful and realistic goals and performance standards which lend themselves to measurement after the fact. Both the incumbent in the position and the supervisor who appraises his performance must have a common understanding of what constitutes satisfactory performance. (6:28)

The philosophy as expressed by these and other current thinkers was that any evaluation system which is to be used for salary administration should, in as far as possible, be objective rather than subjective and be clearly understood by both the employee and the administrator before the rating period. In the case of professionals, however, the system should allow for personal differences, motives, and objectives and make the compensation commensurate with the

level of achievement of a set of mutually agreed to performance objectives. There are a number of evaluation and salary administration plans which have evolved during the past two decades in an attempt to meet these criteria. Five of the currently most popular plans are:

(1) Simple ranking and order-of-merit.

(2) Man-to-man comparison.

(3) Rating scale method.

(4) Checklist method.

(5) Employee evaluation by objectives.

Each of these methods is discussed in some length by Zollitsch and Langsner in their textbook, Wage and Salary Administration (17:359-92), and by Patten in his text, Pay: Employee Compensation and Incentive Plans (12:343-79). These five methods were analyzed as described in the procedures section of this report and that analysis formed a foundation for the policy developed in the practicum.

The significance of this practicum is clear in that as a result of the practicum modern scientific management techniques are now applied to faculty salary administration. Not only are the faculty aware of the criteria which will be considered paramount for salary increases, but the department head is able to effectively evaluate the level of performance of individual faculty members and compensate them accordingly. As Jack Ray, Director of Personnel

Administration at Indiana University, points out in the College and University Personnel Journal, "Salary administration is vitally important to college and university employees and institutional treasurers. (It is the largest single disbursement function.) From both points of view, it deserves careful implementation policies, plans, and practices." (14:64)

The NOVA University Guide for the Educational Policy Systems Module states, "The Educational Policy Systems Module is concerned with: . . . the process by which policies are developed at the institutional level." (8:2) Since this practicum involved the development and documentation of an institutional policy concerning the distribution of salary increases for the Industrial Engineering Technology Department at the Southern Technical Institute, the subject was appropriate for the Educational Policy Systems Core Module of the Ed. D. programs at the NOVA University.

PROCEDURE

The Head of the Industrial Engineering Technology (IET) Department and the Dean of the Southern Technical Institute jointly identified a set of performance characteristics to be used as criteria for the distribution of salary increases to the faculty of the IET Department. A team of faculty

members with expertise in the areas of wage and salary administration, work measurement, and industrial psychology then participated in a brainstorming session (10:151-93) in which current evaluation and salary administration techniques were examined to identify the technique most appropriate for use at the Southern Technical Institute. The team then designed a policy and evaluation instrument to measure the faculty performance characteristics previously determined and allocate salary increases in accordance with the selected technique.

To establish the validity of the policy, all members of the Industrial Engineering Technology faculty were evaluated by the Department Head and a salary increase distribution determined using the new policy. This distribution was then compared to the distribution previously made in April 1977 using the validation criteria listed in the discussion section of the practicum report.

Since this practicum was developmental in nature, no sampling, data collection, questionnaires, or statistical methods were employed.

RESULTS

After review of Board of Regents' and institutional policy, the Dean of the Southern Technical Institute and

the Head of the Industrial Engineering Technology Department agreed that the criteria to be used for the distribution of salary increases should be essentially the same criteria used for academic promotion and tenure at the Institution. These criteria are:

(1) Effective teaching

(2) Contributions as an educator.

(3) Academic growth and development.

(4) Professional development.

(5) Service fo the Institute, students, and community.

(6) Industrial experience.

(7) Seniority.

The first task of the departmental brainstorming team was to develop a set of measurable descriptions which could be used to evaluate faculty performance against the specified criteria. The criteria and their descriptions were made a part of the new departmental policy which is included as Appendix A to this practicum report.

In addition to the evaluation techniques listed on Pages 7 and 8 of this report, the brainstorming team considered an additional evaluation technique known as "the critical incident method." The team selected a combination of the "critical incident" and the "rating scale" methods as most appropriate for the evaluation of professional educators. The advantages and shortcomings of this

combination of methods as well as the rationale for their choice is provided in the discussion section of this report.

Finally, since the Dean and Department Head agreed that in each of the ten cases the new system provided a salary policy superior to the old method, in accordance with the validation criteria listed in the discussion section of this report, the technique was assumed valid and a departmental policy was written and implemented on a one-year test basis. That policy and the evaluation instrument are included as Appendix A to this report. A tabulation of the validation results are included as Appendix C.

It should be noted that the actual evaluation forms used in the validation process contain information relative to individual faculty salaries and levels of performance. This information is considered to be personal, private, and highly confidential by the Dean and the faculty members, and they have requested that the information not be made public. To obtain the cooperation essential for the development and validation of the salary distribution policy, it was necessary to respect the request. The actual data used for validation purposes has therefore been omitted from this report. A fictitious but typical evaluation form has, however, been included as Appendix B to illustrate the evaluation method and calculations necessary in the salary distribution determination.

DISCUSSION

In selecting the same performance factors for salary increases as the Regents use for promotion and tenure, the Dean and IET Department Head recognized the necessity for consistency in evaluation criteria. The faculty are familiar with the promotion and tenure award criteria, and although there may be differences of opinion concerning the relative importance of the individual criteria there is general agreement that the criteria do measure those characteristics and attributes felt to be most desirable in our faculty. This prior acceptance facilitated the faculty acceptance of the salary increase criteria and made adoption of the policy somewhat easier.

When developing the descriptors for evaluation of performance, the brainstorming team acknowledged that some of the criteria such as "education and experience" depend on objective assessments while other criteria such as "effective teaching" depend on subjective evaluations. In keeping with sound wage and salary administrative policy, they decided that even the subjective judgments should be made as objective as possible.

The "rating scale method" of performance evaluation, as described by Zollitsch (17:381), "employees defined

factors (traits, characteristics) in the format of a chart or rating form. In order to evaluate an employee's qualifications and qualities for the purpose of measuring his relative value, the rater is required to check the rated value on a line with ascending or descending degrees." The objectivity of this method is derived from the fact that the rater makes several small subjective evaluations rather than a few large subjective evaluations. The theory is that a large number of small subjective judgments lead to more objectivity than a few gross subjective judgments.

The critical incident method of performance appraisal as described by Patten (12:343-79), requires that the supervisor list or document activities or incidents, on the part of the employee, which justify a rating other than typical. When combined with the rating scale method, the Department Head will rate each characteristic as "typical" unless he can justify (and document) either a superior or substandard rating. This also fosters objectivity in evaluation and focuses attention on performance rather than personality.

The Department Head and the Dean are best qualified to determine if one salary distribution is superior to another. They therefore validated the new policy. In performing the validation, each of the ten faculty evaluations were

examined with respect to the following seven questions:

(1) Did the new system provide a distribution of salary increases which more closely reflected the actual faculty performance during the past year?

(2) Did the new method provide more factual information upon which to base a decision?

(3) Was the decision as to the dollar allocation easier to make with the new system?

(4) Would it be easier to explain to a faculty member why he received a specific raise if the new system were used?

(5) Would it be easier to explain and justify the salary increase distribution to the Dean under the new system?

(6) Would the new system insure a better understanding by the faculty of the criteria to be used for future raises?

(7) Does the new system provide a tool for faculty development and guidance by the Department Head?

It was agreed prior to the validation experiment that an affirmative answer to the majority of the questions in at least eight of the ten evaluations would be sufficient evidence to presume validation. As reported in the results section and documented in Appendix C of this practicum

report, the new policy was considered superior in all ten evaluations, and the validity of the policy was affirmed.

IMPLICATIONS, LIMITATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The implications of the new policy and potential for positive improvement in the administration of Industrial Engineering Technology Department are clear. For the first time sound management and wage and salary procedures will be used in the distribution of salary increases in that:

(1) Each faculty member will be aware of the criteria against which he will be evaluated during the coming year.

(2) The Department Head will examine and document each faculty member's performance against a previously established criteria, emphasizing objectivity in evaluation and reducing subjectivity to a series of small evaluations.

(3) The salary increase received by each faculty member will be more closely in proportion to his performance and justification of the merit award will be simplified.

A potential limitation of the new policy is that the Department Head will be more closely involved in the daily activities of each faculty member. He must make frequent

observations of performance in order to document the critical incidents upon which the rating will be based. Some of the faculty may object to such close scrutiny and consider it an encroachment on academic freedom. Clearly those faculty members will have to be convinced that the observations are made primarily to identify superior performance rather than document substandard performance.

A second potential limitation of the new procedure is that all the ratings must be accomplished by the same rater. This is true not only to assure consistency in rating but also to avoid a "halo" effect which is so prevalent in many rating systems. In order for the rating method to discriminate between substandard, typical, and superior performance, the employees must be rated honestly. If all employees receive superior ratings, there will be no discrimination, and all will receive the same merit raise. If several raters are involved, they may each try to "get the most" for each person they rate, and the result will be an inordinate number of superior ratings. If all employees are evaluated by the same rater, he will be forced to discriminate with respect to performance in order to have a salary increase distribution which reflects performance. Although the policy may be used for the entire institution, evaluation must be accomplished at the departmental level.

The salary increase distribution policy has been implemented on a test basis for one year. One reason for the test period was that the policy was developed during the summer quarter when five of the departmental faculty were not available for consultation. Most wage and salary administration authorities agree that maximum effectiveness will be achieved when the employee has had an opportunity to participate in the development or concur in the evaluation policy. In order to elicit maximum cooperation and acceptance by the entire departmental faculty, during the next year all faculty members will be encouraged to submit suggestions for improvement of the policy (including the evaluation instrument). At the end of the test period, the suggestions will be considered and if consensus is achieved on a modification, a new modified policy will be written and tested. If validity is confirmed, the modified policy will be implemented for the following year.

It is recommended that this modification procedure be repeated periodically to facilitate updating and maintaining a policy which is in keeping with the changing objectives of the department. It is important to remember, however, that faculty evaluations must be made using only a policy which has been enforced during the evaluation period. To use a new modified policy developed after the rating period would violate the principle that the employees must be

aware of the policy under which they will be evaluated at the beginning of the evaluation period.

A copy of this report has been placed in the Southern Technical Institute Library, and copies of the abstract distributed to each academic department head with the recommendation that they consider adoption of a similar policy.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Belinsky, Harmon S., "Evolution of Plans and Ratings of Employee Performance," as quoted in U. S. Congress, Senate. Efficiency Ratings: Hearings on S. Res. 105 and S. Res. 124, 80th Congress, 2nd Session.

2. Bellows, Roger M., Employment Psychology: The Interview, New York, Rinehart, 1954.

3. Blackwell, T. E., College and University Administration, New York, Center for Applied Research in Education, 1966.

4. Drucker, Peter F., Management Tasks, Responsibilities, Practices, New York, McGraw-Hill, 1972.

5. Engineering Council for Professional Development, 43rd Annual Report: 1975. New York: United Engineering Center, 1975.

6. Handy, Arthur A., Jr., "Pay for Performance," The Personnel Administrator, May-June, 1972.

7. Heilbroner, Robert, The Worldly Philosophers, New York, Simon and Schuster, 1953.

8. McCabe, Robert H., The Educational Policy Systems, National Ed. D. Program for Community College Faculty, NOVA University, 1973.

9. McGregor, Douglas, "An Uneasy Look at Performance Appraisal," Harvard Business Review, Vol. 35, No. 3, May-June, 1957.

10. Osborn, Alex F., Applied Imagination Principles and Procedures of Creative Problem-Solving, Scribner's Sons, New York, 1963.

11. Patten, Thomas H., "OD MBO and the RIP System," Personnel Administration, March-April, 1972.

12. Patten, Thomas H., Jr., Pay: Employee Compensation and Incentive Plans, New York, MacMillan Publishing Co., 1977.

13. Payer, Robert C., "A Systems Approach to Results Oriented Performance Evaluation," Personnel Administration/Public Personnel Review, November-December, 1972.

14. Ray, Jack N., "A Basic Approach to Salary or Wage Administration," College and University Personnel Journal, August, 1971.

15. Van Fleet, David, "Progression Curves in Salary Administration for Colleges and Universities," College and University Personnel Journal, July, 1975.

16. Woodburne, L. S., Faculty Personnel Policies in Higher Education, New York, Harper, 1950.

17. Zollitsch and Langsner, Wage and Salary Administration, New York, Southwestern Publishing Company, 1970.

APPENDIX A

DEVELOPED POLICY AND PROCEDURE GOVERNING THE DISTRIBUTION OF SALARY INCREASES FOR THE FACULTY OF THE INDUSTRIAL ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY DEPARTMENT

POLICY AND PROCEDURE GOVERNING THE DISTRIBUTION OF MERIT SALARY INCREASES FOR THE FACULTY OF THE INDUSTRIAL ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY DEPARTMENT

I. GENERAL

This policy establishes the criteria and procedures for the distribution of merit salary increases to the faculty of the Industrial Engineering Technology Department. The policy is implemented on a one-year test basis after which it shall be (1) implemented as a permanent policy, (2) modified and tested for an additional year, or (3) cancelled and removed from the Policy Manual.

II. SCOPE

This policy concerns the distribution of merit salary increases only and then only in the absence of specific guidelines from the Institute or Regents. All "cost of living," "across the board," or directed salary increases shall be assigned prior to the distribution of merit raises as described in this policy and procedure. This policy shall apply only to the full-time faculty of the Industrial Engineering Technology Department.

III. POLICY

The criteria to be considered in the evaluation of Industrial Engineering Technology Department faculty shall include, but is not necessarily limited to, the following:

A. Effective Teaching as evidenced by but not limited to:
   1. Command of the subject.
   2. Quality of instruction.
   3. Ability to motivate students towards learning.
   4. Quality of lecture notes, examinations, and other material.
   5. Rapport with students.
   6. Preparation for class.
   7. Punctuality and dependability in meeting class.

B. Contributions as an Educator as evidenced by but not limited to:
   1. Leadership in developing new courses.
   2. Participation in student recruitment.
   3. Participation in student advisement.
   4. Development and participation in continuing education courses.

C. Academic Growth and Development as evidenced by but not limited to:
   1. Active membership in professional academic societies.
   2. Attendance at short courses and seminars.
   3. Work towards advanced degree.
   4. Development of new competence.

D. Professional Development as evidenced by but not limited to:
   1. Active membership in professional nonacademic societies.
   2. Professional registration.
   3. Participation in professional nonacademic seminars.
   4. Authorship of professional papers and articles.

E. Service to the Institute, Students, and Community as evidenced by but not limited to:
   1. Service on departmental, institutional, and Regents' committees.
   2. Writing of proposals for grants.
   3. Service as faculty advisor to student organizations.
   4. Active participation in civic and community activities.
   5. Ad hoc service and special recognitions.

F. Industrial Experience as evidenced by the significance and relevancy of industrial or consulting experience with particular emphasis on current industrial experience gained during the past five years.

G. Seniority as evidenced by sustained satisfactory performance in post secondary education with particular emphasis on longivity and dedicated service at the Southern Technical Institute.

IV. PROCEDURE

Except when specific guidance is provided by the Institution or the Board of Regents, the following procedures will be used in establishing the distribution of merit salary increases for the faculty of the Industrial Engineering Technology Department.

A. During the fall quarter each year, the Head of the IET Department will invite the departmental faculty to review the criteria described in paragraph III above. At that time, he will indicate the relative importance (weighty factors) to place on each of the seven criteria and encourage each faculty member to discuss privately actions which the faculty member may take to enhance his potential for a favorable merit increase.

B. During the academic year the Department Head will make frequent observations of each faculty member's performance in respect to the evaluation criteria and where appropriate document either superior or less than typical performance. This documentation will be used as described in paragraph D below.

C. During spring quarter each year, the Department Head will invite the faculty members to submit additional evidence of performance in any of the criteria areas. This need not be a formal submission but may be merely a verbal reminder of accomplishments during the past year. This evidence will be used as described in paragraph D below.

D. After reviewing the documentation gathered and evidence submitted, the Department Head will evaluate each faculty member's performance using the evaluation form (Attachment 1). In making this evaluation, a numerical value of 3 (typical performance) will be awarded for any criteria for which substantiative evidence indicating superior or subtypical performance is not available. Where a numerical value other than 3 is awarded, a justification statement will be made under the appropriate heading.

E. Weighting factors reflecting the relative importance of the seven criteria, as described in paragraph A above, are entered in the appropriate column on the form and the evaluation value for each criteria multiplied by its weighting factor. The sum of all such products is then taken. This sum is the individual faculty member's evaluation score.

F. From the total salary increase budget available, "across the board raises," "cost of living raises," and "directed increases" (in recognition of promotion or special achievement) are first allocated. The remaining uncommitted budget is the dollar amount available for merit increases.

G. The grand total of all the faculty members' evaluation scores is determined, and this value is divided into the dollar amount available for merit increases. The quotient is the "dollars per point" to be awarded for merit increases. This value of "dollars per point" is then multiplied by the individual faculty member's evaluation score to obtain his total merit increase.

H. The total salary increase for each faculty member will be the sum of his merit increase and any across the board, cost of living, or directed increases.

FACULTY EVALUATION AND SALARY DETERMINATION

Name _____ Academic Year _____

Rank _____

	Performance Score (Note 1)	Criteria Weight	Evaluation Score
A. Effective Teaching (justification for other than 3)	1 2 3 4 5		
B. Contribution as an Educator (justification for other than 3)	1 2 3 4 5		
C. Academic Growth & Development (justification for other than 3)	1 2 3 4 5		
D. Professional Development (justification for other than 3)	1 2 3 4 5		
E. Service to the Institute, Student, and Community (justification for other than 3)	1 2 3 4 5		
F. Industrial Experience (justification for other than 3)	1 2 3 4 5		
G. Seniority Less than 1 yr = 1 2 thru 5 yrs = 2 6 thru 10 yrs = 3 11 thru 15 yrs = 4 Longer than 15 = 5 Less than a Masters (-1) For a Doctorate (+1) (Note 2)	1 2 3 4 5		

TOTAL EVALUATION SCORE _____

(continued)

Faculty Evaluation and Salary Determination (continued)

Comments

Salary Computations

Current Salary			$_____
Cost of Living Increase	_____%	$_____	
Across the Board Increase		$_____	
Directed Increase		$_____	
Merit Increase ($ per point X Evaluation Score) $ per point X points		$_____	
Total Increase		$_____	$_____
New Salary			$_____
Percent Increase	_____%		

Note 1: 1 = Needs Improvement, 2 = Acceptable, 3 = Typical, 4 = Good, 5 = Superior.

Note 2: Maximum 5, minimum 1.

APPENDIX B

SAMPLE EVALUATION AND SALARY COMPUTATIONS

FACULTY EVALUATION AND SALARY DETERMINATION

Name Smith John Academic Year 1976-77

Rank Assoc. Prof.

	Performance Score (Note 1)	Criteria Weight	Evaluation Score
A. Effective Teaching (justification for other than 3)	1 2 (3) 4 5	5	15
B. Contribution as an Educator (justification for other than 3) 1. advises 10 students 2. presented one con-ed	1 2 3 (4) 5	3	12
C. Academic Growth & Development (justification for other than 3) 1. presented paper to ASEE	1 2 3 (4) 5	1	4
D. Professional Development (justification for other than 3)	1 2 (3) 4 5	1	3
E. Service to the Institute, Student, and Community (justification for other than 3) 1. Served on Regents Comm. 2. Faculty advisor to frat. 3. Ad-hoc selection comm	1 2 3 (4) 5	2	8
F. Industrial Experience (justification for other than 3) No relevant industrial experience in past 5 years	(1) 2 3 4 5	2	2
G. Seniority Less than 1 yr = 1 2 thru 5 yrs = 2 (6 thru 10 yrs = 3) 11 thru 15 yrs = 4 Longer than 15 = 5 Less than a Masters (-1) For a Doctorate (+1) (Note 2)	1 2 (3) 4 5	2	6
	TOTAL EVALUATION SCORE		50

(continued)

Faculty Evaluation and Salary Determination (continued)

Comments

1. Need current industrial experience. Should work in industry this summer instead of teaching

2. Encourage Active participation in professional non academic activities.

Salary Computations

Current Salary			$13,500
Cost of Living Increase	2½ %	$ 337.50	
Across the Board Increase		$ —	
Directed Increase		$ —	
Merit Increase ($ per point X Evaluation Score) $ per point X points		$ 935.50	
Total Increase		$ 1273.00	$ 1,2??
New Salary			$ 14,??3
Percent Increase	9.42 %		

Note 1: 1 = Needs Improvement, 2 = Acceptable, 3 = Typical, 4 = Good, 5 = Superior.

Note 2: Maximum 5, minimum 1.

SAMPLE CALCULATIONS

Total Increase Available		14,000
Cost of Living 2.5% x 140,735	3520	
Across the Board	—	
Directed Increases (3 promotions)	1500	
	5020	- 5020
Available for Merit Increase		8980
Grand Total Evaluation Points	480	
Merit Dollars Per Point	(8980 ÷ 480) =	$18.71 per point

APPENDIX C

TABULATION OF VALIDATION RESULTS

TABLE I

TABULATION OF THE RESULTS OF THE COMPARATIVE EVALUATION OF THE NEW INSTITUTIONAL POLICY FOR THE DISTRIBUTION OF SALARY INCREASES TO THE INDUSTRIAL ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY DEPARTMENT

	Responses to Validation Questions (page 13 & 14)		
Faculty Member	Affirmative Responses	Negative Responses	Better Method
Aft	7	0	New
Black	7	0	New
Carmichael	6	1	New
Eller	5	2	New
Franklin	6	1	New
Keen	5	2	New
McPherson	5	2	New
Tritschler	6	1	New
Wimberly	7	0	New
Young	6	1	New